



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/591,687	06/12/2000	Robert Rosko	47004.000074	4829

21967 7590 10/18/2002

HUNTON & WILLIAMS
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2002

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/591,687

Applicant(s)

ROSKO et al

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 29, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2155

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 7/29/2002. Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Heddaya et al., US pat. No.6,205,481.

As to claim 1, Lavey discloses the steps of:

The host service provider (23 fig.2A) receiving the single login, the service provider having a universal session manager (i.e., using server system 40 fig.2B to process data information and user validation, see abstract, figs. 2A, 2B, col.2 lines 33-64, col.4 line 59 to col.6 line 23).

The universal session manager retrieving data from a validation database based on the single login to the service provider, wherein the data is effective for accessing a remote service provider and is based at least in part on the received username and password (i.e., using user

Art Unit: 2155

identification and password, see col.4 line 59 line 36 to col.7 line 22 and col.10 line 13 to col.11 line 52).

transmitting data to the remote service provider and directing the user to the remote service provider (see col.2 lines 33-64 and col.6 line 24 to col.7 line 67).

As to claims 2 and 10, Lavey discloses a trusted service module acts as an intermediary between the host service provider and the trusted service provider (i.e., helping to select an appropriate ISP, see fig.4, col.6 line 24 to col.7 line 67 and col.7 line 23 to col.9 line 49).

As to claim 3, Lavey discloses receiving the session ID (tokens) from the trusted service provider (see col.6 line 5 to col.7 line 67).

As to claims 4, 6 and 9, Lavey discloses placing a text file on the user's network data acquisition module and registering the user with the remote service provider (see col.6 line 5 to col.7 line 67 and col.8 line 17 to col.9 line 41).

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1. For the added limitations, Lavey further discloses:

a user system having a network data acquisition module and plurality of a remote service providers (see fig.2A, 2B, col.4 line 59 to col.6 line 23).

Art Unit: 2155

a universal session manager for receiving a user's ID and password and passing data required for access to said remote service provider and a validation database (43 fig.2B) for storing information for accessing the remote service provider (see fig.9, col.5 line 11 to col.7 line 67 and col.11 line 11 to col.12 line 44).

As to claims 11, 13-15, Lavey discloses a remote service provider with access requirements, registration module for receiving data to the services, a login module for gaining access the data for registering a user with the remote service provider (see col.6 line 5 to col.7 line 67 and col.8 line 17 to col.9 line 41).

As to claim 12, Lavey discloses a Internet Browser (see col.3 line 48 to col.4 line 58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2155

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lavey et al, US pat. No.6,023,698.

Lavey 's teachings still applied as in item 3 above. Lavey does not specifically disclose a cookie. However, using a cookie identify users in a Web server is generally well known in the art. It would have been obvious if not inherent to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement a cookie in Lavey's computer system to control users' account information because it would have enabled a server to identify users' interactions more quickly.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Applicant further asserts that lavey does not discloses the service provider having a universal session manage.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lavey discloses the service provider having a universal session manager (i.e., using server system 40 fig.2B to process data information, see figs. 2A, 2B, col.2 lines 33-64, col.4 line 59 to col.6 line 23) as rejected above.

Conclusion

8. Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are **rejected**.

Art Unit: 2155

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for this group are:

After Final: (703) 746-7239

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/ Draft: (703) 746-7240

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire THREE months from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (35 U.S.C. Sect.133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(A).


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Application/Control Number: 09/591,687

Page 7

Art Unit: 2155

Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2155
10/15/2002


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100